UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,605	11/10/2000	Kelly Robert McCaw	PALM-3302.US.P	5071

7590	12/12/2003

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 November 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

11/07/2003 has been entered.

2.   This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 11/07/2003.

3.   Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21 are independent

claims. In the Amendment A, claims 1, 5-7, 11, 15-17, 21, 25-27 have been amended, no

claims have been added or cancelled. This action is made non-Final.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 11/10/2000 are not **approved** by the Draftperson under 37

CFR 1.84 or 1.152 for the reasons submitted in Form PTO 948.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-13, 15-18, 21-23, 25-28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Boothby et al. (US Patent No. 6,044,381), in view of Novak et

al. (US Patent No. 6,643,669).

As to claims 1, 11, 21, Boothby teaches:

"a) designating a first database as a source database and a second database as a

target database" at col. 2, line 33 to col. 3, line 58, ;

"b) determining a state of a first modification flag of a first data record in said

source database, wherein said first modification flag indicates that said first data record in

said source database has been modified" at col. 4, line 59 to col. 5, line 41, col. 2, line 23

to col. 3, line 3;

"c) provided that said first modification flag is set, propagating said first data

record in said source database to said first data record in said target database" at col. 4,

line 59 to col. 5, line 41, col. 2, lines 56-65, col. 12, lines 49-65;

Boothby does not expressly teach "d) provided that said first modification flag is

not set comparing a first modification count of said first data record in said source

database with a second modification count of said first data record in said target database,

said first and second modification counts each being a value indicating how many times

said first data record in said source database and said first data record in said target

database has been modified respectively". However, Novak teaches this limitation at col.

3, lines 44-56, col. 5, lines 40-49, col. 4, line 61 to col. 5, line 16.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine the teachings of Boothby with the teachings of Novak to include

step (d) in order to provide an improved method of synchronization between a database

located within both a client and a server such that the database need not be locked during

the synchronization process.

Boothby does not specifically teach "e) provided that said first modification count

has a higher value than said second modification count, propagating said first data record

in said source database to said first data record in said target database, wherein said steps

a) through e) can be completed without comparing raw data of said first data record and

said corresponding data record". However, Novak teaches this limitation at col. 4, line

61 to col. 5, line 16, col. 3, lines 44-56, col. 5, line 40-49.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine the teachings of Boothby with the teachings of Gehani to

include step (e) in order to provide an improved method of synchronization between a

database located within both a client and a server such that the database need not be

locked during the synchronization process.

As to claims 2, 12, 22, Novak teaches "the step f) of incrementing said second

modification count to said higher value of said first modification count" at col. 5, lines

40-49, col. 3, lines 44-56.

As to claims 3, 13, 23, Boothby teaches steps a) through c), Novak teaches steps

d) through f) as described herein above, and are repeated until all of said data records in

said source database have been processed.

As per claims 5, 15, 25, Boothby teaches "step c) comprises the steps of: clearing said first modification flag" at col. 15, lines 23-34, col. 11, lines 8-19.

As per claims 6, 16, 26, Boothby teaches "step c) comprises the steps of: creating a new data record in said target database according to said first data record in said source database, provided that said first modification flag is set to indicate that said first data record is new in said source database and that said first data record does not exist in said target database" at col. 15, lines 23-34, col. 11, lines 21-38;

"clearing said first modification flag" at col. 15, lines 23-34, col. 11, lines 8-19.

As per claims 7, 17, 27, Boothby teaches "step c) comprises the step of marking said corresponding data record as deleted in said target database, provided that said first modification flag is set to indicate that said first data record has been deleted from said source database and that said corresponding data record exists and is not already marked as deleted in said target database" at col. 8, lines 9-24, col. 12, lines 49-65.

As per claims 8, 18, 28, Boothby teaches "first database and said second database reside in different host systems" at col. 2, line 33 to col. 3, line 58, Abstract.

6.   Claims 4, 14, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boothby et al. (US Patent No. 6,044,381), in view of Boothby et al. (US Patent No. 6,532,480).

As to claims 4, 14, 24, Boothby ('381) does not specifically teach "g) redesignating said second database as said source database and said first database as said target database". However, Boothby ('480) teaches this limitation at col. 5, lines 31-63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Boothby ('381) with the teachings of Boothby ('480) to include step "g) redesignating said second database as said source database and said first database as said target database" in order to provide method of synchronizing multiple databases of different Applications.

Step "h)" is rejected under same rationale given above to claim 3, that is, Boothby ('381) teaches steps a) through c), Novak teaches steps d) through f), and the performing all these steps are repeated until all of said data records in said source database have been processed.

7.   Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29, 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boothby et al. (US Patent No. 6,044,381), in view of Taivalsaari et al. (US Patent No. 6,366,898).

As per claims 9, 19, 29, Boothby does not explicitly teach "first database resides in a personal digital assistant (PDA)". However, Taivalsaari teaches this limitation at col. 2, lines 14-29.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Boothby with the teachings of Taivalsaari to

include in order to provide a method of creating and periodically loading a database of classfile on a non traditional computer device, such as a PDA.

As per claims 10, 20, 30, Boothby does not specifically teach "second database resides in a computer system to which a personal digital assistant (PDA) can be coupled via a cradle device". However, Taivalsaari teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 30-53.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Boothby with the teachings of Taivalsaari to include "second database resides in a computer system to which a personal digital assistant (PDA) can be coupled via a cradle device" in order to provide a method of creating and periodically loading a database of classfile on a non traditional computer device, such as a PDA, cellular telephone,..., or other embedded device.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments regarding Gehani does not teach steps d) and e) with respect to claims 1, 11, 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Furthermore, in response to the Applicant's argument that Boothby ('676) does not teach "provided that said first modification flag is set, propagating said first data record to said target database", Boothby ('381) , however, does teach this limitation at col. 4, line 59 to col. 5, line 3.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

        Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.
        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 872-9306. The TC 2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Miranda Le
December 5, 2003

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER